

TRANSLATION OF THE OFFICE ACTION

ID No.: GJ17 Dispatch No.: 061,355, Dispatch Date: February 3, 2009

OFFICE ACTION

Application Number	Application No. 2006-520,894
Drafting Date	January 29, 2009
Examiner of JPO	Munehiko HIGUCHI 9118 2W00
Attorney	Mr. Yasuo YASUTOMI
Applicable Articles	Article 29(1), Article 29(2), Article 36

This application is to be rejected for the below-mentioned reasons. If any, a response should be submitted within 3 months from the Dispatch Date of this action.

Reasons

<1> The inventions according to the following Claims of the present application should not be granted a patent under Patent Law Article 29(1)(iii), because the inventions were described in the following distributed publication or made publicly available through an electric telecommunication line in Japan or a foreign country prior to the filing thereof.

<2> The inventions according to the below-mentioned claims of this application should not be granted a patent under Patent Law Article 29(2), because the inventions could have been easily made prior to the filing thereof by a person skilled in the art, on the basis of the inventions described in the following distributed publication or made publicly available through an electric telecommunication line in Japan or a foreign country, prior to the filing thereof.

Remarks (concerning references, see Reference List)

- Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 14, 15

- References 1, 2
- Reasons 1, 2

Reference 1 discloses inventions relating to a method for forming a concave hologram in a flat medium (Fig. 4) or in a concave medium (Fig. 5) using a convex mirror such as a spherical mirror, and relating to such a hologram being formed (hereinafter, referred to as "reference invention 1"). It is obvious and commonly known that a variation of a physical property, such as distortion, of the medium in which a hologram is formed induces a change of its optical characteristic. It is also obvious and commonly known that the hologram can be used as a sensor by, for example, irradiating the hologram with a collimated light, based on the above mechanism (see Reference 2 if necessary).

Furthermore, the property of being "capable of effecting retroreflection" is just a property that general mirrors have.

Thus, no specific difference can be found between the invention according to the above claims of the present application and the reference invention 1. Even if the clear statement of the use as the sensor is regarded as the different point, this difference is not a particular one in view of the commonly-known technique as mentioned above.

- Claim 4
- References 1-3
- Reason 2

A hologram functioning as a retroreflective screen is commonly known as disclosed in Reference 3 (see [0061] in the translation into Japanese).

- Claim 11
- References 1, 2, 4
- Reason 2

Recording of a hologram using a corner cube is a commonly-known technique (see Reference 4).

- Claims 12, 13
- Reference 1, 2, 5
- Reason 2

Recording of a hologram using reflective bead(s) or a lens is a commonly-known technique (see Reference 5).

- Claims 3, 9
- References 1, 2
- Reasons 1, 2

As Reference 1 discloses recording of a concave hologram using a convex mirror, recording of a hologram using a curved reflective mirror and forming the recorded hologram into a curved shape are commonly known. A shape of the mirror and a shape of the curved surface of the recorded hologram are merely factors to be appropriately selected at each time, so that the limitation of each shape to the convex or concave shape is not regarded as a special technical feature.

- Claim 7
- References 1, 2
- Reasons 1, 2

Use of a planar mirror for recording a hologram is commonly known as disclosed in Reference 2. Basically, a hologram is recorded based on a shape of an interference plane; thus, an optical system for forming the interference plane does not directly relate to the shape of the interference plane and is just a factor to be selected depending on the wavefront shape of a light from a light source.

Reference List

1. GB-A 2,054,995
2. US-A 5,989,923
3. WO 03/058,979 (Translation into Japanese: JP-T 2005-515,487)
4. JP-A 2002-170,247

5. JP-A H11-231,763

<3> The statement in Claims of the present application does not comply with the requirement of Patent Law Article 36(6)(ii) on the points mentioned below.

Remarks

(1) It is unclear what kind of limitation is intended for the phrase "capable of effecting retroreflection" in Claim 10.

Retroreflection is just a function that general mirrors can effect.

Thus, the invention according to Claim 10 and the dependent claims thereof is unclear.

<Caution and suggestion for amendment>

(1) In the case of the amendment in Description and Claims, the amended part should be underlined (Enforcement Regulations of the Patent Law Article 13(6)). In the claim amended in part, only the amended part should be underlined (do not underline the entire amended claim).

(2) The amendment must be made within the scope of the matters described in Description, Claims, or Drawings originally applied, or within the scope of the matters which is obvious from the matters described in Description, Claims, or Drawings originally applied. In the case of the amendment, Applicant should insist on the reason why the amendment is legal in Response, with the supporting part in the originally-applied Description and the like being indicated (with respect to the form of Response, see the form of the request for correction in a trial for invalidation).

Inquiries on the present Office Action:

Examiner: Munehiko HIGUCHI

Physical analysis Division

First Patent Examination Department

TEL. 03(3581)1101 (extension 3292)

FAX. 03(3592)8858 (Contact by phone in advance)

Record of search results of prior art documents

- The field searched

G01N21/00-21/61

G01B11/00-11/30

G01K

PATOLIS

- Prior art documents

US-B1 6,483,611

US-A 5,461,499

JP-A H06-107,037

JP-A S62-119,437

This record of search results of prior art documents does not constitute reasons for rejection.

(END)